

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
 CONFIRMATION NO.

 09/919,555
 07/31/2001
 Herbert F. Cattell
 10010326-2
 4382

 7590
 12/07/2004
 EXAMINER

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC. Intellectual Property Administration Legal Department, DL429 P.O. Box 7599 Loveland, CO 80537-0599

FORMAN, BETTY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

1634

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/919,555	CATTELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BJ Forman	1634
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.		
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-16 and 45-54</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:		
		BJ Forman Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1634

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In re Ngai (70 USPQ2d, 1862) wherein the court have stated that a new set of instructions in a known product merely teaches a new use for an existing product.

Applicant traverses the previous rejection and asserts that the claimed instructions "for selecting one or more readable algorithms" distinguishes over the prior art teaching of instructions. The argument has been thoroughly reviewed but is not found persuasive in view of In re Ngai (70 USPQ2d, 1862).

BJ FORMAN, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER